Sectt. II-29—27,084—25-11-26.

Development (1926) Department.

M. SERIES.

G.O. No. 1209

DATED 19- 8 -1926

[Despatch Abstract.]

L.C. Anantapur

Grant of reserved forests for cultivation in Kollegal Taluk

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Council Office

Starred Question ೩-2-26

Mr.C.V.Venkataramana Ayyangar.

THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

---

*.2093. Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state---

(a) whether the Collector of Coimbatore and other officers have received several applications from the ryots in various parts of the Kollegal taluk that there are no sufficient lands for cultivation in that taluk and that specific portions of reserved forests may be granted to them for cultivation purposes; and

(b) whether the Revenue Divisional Officer has recommended the grant of some lands and if so what has become of those recommendations; and

(c) whether the Government have any proposal before them to appoint a small committee to go into this question and to report upon the whole question and if not, whether they have any objection to consider such a proposal?

V.R.

2/

Dem. Dept.

Dft. No. 3-95-I/26-A.24-2-26.

Dft. No.

24/2

24/2

The C. C. F. is furnished with a copy of L. C. Question No. 2093 which Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar proposes to ask at the next meeting of the Council and he is requested to furnish information on the points raised in it.

23-2-26

23.2.26

23.2.26

DESPATCHED
28/2

1/6

* The C. C. 2.

Returned Dft. dealt for issue
8/3.

3

Dem. Dept.

Dpl&B.

Ott No 596-I/26-2 dt. 8-3-26.

Ref: ~~Corrigendum~~ Ott No. 595-I/26-B
24-2-26 - L.C. Question No 2093
Grant of reserved forests for cultivation
purposes - Coimbatore Dt.

The CC. is requested to state
when a reply may be expected to the
above reference.

8-3-26
8.3.26

To The CCF

Refce.No.1656/26-2

Office of the Chief Conservator of Forests, Chepauk, dated 10-3-26

Dr 856 I 12326

From

H.Tireman Esq., C.I.E.,
Chief Conservator of Forests,
Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Development Department

Sir,

Ref. Government Memo No.595-I/26-2 dated 8th March 1926

Legislative Council, Question No.2093

I am awaiting a report from the District Forest Officer Kollegal who has been reminded.

For Chief Conservator

MS/10-3-26

5

Dem Dept

Dy No 6-95-I/26-3 Dy. 26-3-26.

b-2 Cy.
b-4 Cy.

Ref: OM No 5-95-I/26-1 Dy 24-2-26.
and CC's letter No 1656/26 dt 10/3/26
LC-Question No 2093. Grant of reserved forests for cultivation purposes — Coimbatore Dt.

10/3/26

The CC is requested to state when a reply may be expected to the above reference.

24-3-26

24.3.26

RECEIVED
26 MAR 1926

To the CC

Ref.No.1656/26.

Chief Conservator's Office,

Chepauk, Madras 29th March 1926.

From

H.Tireman Esquire, C.I.E.,

Chief Conservator of Forests, Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Development Department, Fort.St, George, Madras.

Sir,

Ref: Government Memorandum No.595-I/26-3 dated 26th March 1926.

I am awaiting a report from the Conservator of Forests V circle who has been reminded

for Chief Conservator.

M.R.29-3

7

Rev. Dept

O.M. No 595-I/26-4 dt 30-4-26

No 30.4.26

Ref: O.M. No 595-I/26-1 dt 24-2-26 and C.C's letter Ref. No 1656/26 dt 29-8-26 L.C. Question No 2093: Granting reserved forests for cultivation purposes - Coimbatore Dist.

DESPATCH
1st MAY 1926

To the C.C.F.

The C.C is requested to state when a reply may be expected for the above reference

29/4/26.

28.4.26

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT DEPT.
15 MAY 1926

Refce.No.1656/26 Office of the Chief Conservator of Forests, Chepauk, dated 4-5-26

Dev 1313 I 7.5.26

From

H.Tireman Esq.,C.I.E.,
Chief Conservator of Forests,
Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Development Department, Fort St.George.

Sir,

Ref. Government Memo No.595-I/26-1 dated 24-2-26
Legislative Council question 2093.

P.2. Supra

I submit a copy of the District Forest Officer's report which furnishes full information on the points raised in the Legislative Council question and also copies of the Collector's and Conservator's endorsements.

C. Shet 4.5.26

For Chief Conservator

MS/4-5

4.5.26

C.F. 32.

In reply please quote number, date and short

9 15

3066

Forest DEPARTMENT.

Received ..... Registered .....

From (Name) M.R.Ry. J. Sadasiva Ayyar Avaregal. B.A.,

(Designation) District Forest Officer, Kollegal Division.

Post Box ....., (Station) Camp Thattakerai.

Telegraphic Address ..... Defo.

To The Chief Conservator of Forests, Madras.
Through the
Collector of Coimbatore and
The Conservator of Forests, V Circle, Coimbatore.

Ref. No. 253-26-2 & dated ..... March ..... 1926.

Sir,

Enclosures .....

.....

.....

Spare Copies .....

Subject:-- Forests - Reserves - Kollegal Taluk - portio: disafforestation - petitions from ryots - Legislative Council question - information called for - furnished.

Reference:-- Your Ref.No.1656/26-1, dated 2nd March 1926.

I beg to state that several applications from the ryots in various parts of the Kollegal Taluk appear to have been received in 1922 by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kollegal, who, in his letter D.Dis.No.214/Rev. of 1922, dated 29th August 1922 requested that steps ~~may~~ might be taken by me to disafforest about 5000 acres of land in the reserved forests of this Division to be assigned to ryots of 12 villages named in the margin. The Collector has also in his endorsement R.Ref.3669/22-B-1, dated 24th September 1922 called for my report in the matter. As the proposals received from the -- Revenue Divisional Officer did not contain sketches of the areas proposed for disafforestation, enquiries had to be made by the Range Officers by taking the ryots to the forests with a view to locate the areas. In 8 out of the 12 villages concerned, the extent of assessed waste lands available for cultivation was over 500 acres in each, in 8, it was over 1000 acres in each and in one village(Bandally) it was as much as 11526 acres.

1. Andipalayam.
2. Porasagowndan-palayam.
3. Arabikerai.
4. Puthur.
5. Pylore.
6. Annium.
7. Hoogiem.
8. Modally.
9. Bandally.
10. Chickayalur.
11. Jakkalli.
12. Thimmarajapuram.

P.T.O.

The Revenue Divisional Officer stated that a greater portion of this assessed waste was rocky and unfit for cultivation but in the records of enquiry sent to me there was nothing to show that this statement was based on a detailed inspection. On the other hand, it was, as represented to me by the Range Officer, Hanagpuram, incorrect in respect of Hinniem and Hoogium villages and as, on the very face of it, it was incorrect in respect of other villages also, I requested the Revenue Divisional Officer to favour me with maps prepared on the basis of a detailed inspection of the assessed waste lands in each village by the concerned Revenue Inspectors with the areas fit and unfit for cultivation marked with distinguishing colours I requested also that the reports and maps relating to each village might be sent to me as soon as the inspection in each village was finished, so that I might deal with it and submit my proposals to the Collector, who could, from the detailed information thus furnished, judge whether the demand for disafforestation was justified in each case. On my placing the above facts before the Collector in my office-notes Nos. 1037 Sub. of 28, dated 16th and 29th January 1923, he was pleased to order in his Proogs. Ref.No.B-1-3669/22, dated 4th February 1923 as follows:--

X X X X X

The Revenue Divisional Officer should have the existing assessed waste carefully inspected and get a good percentage of it checked by the Tahsildar or check it himself. He should then submit revised proposals after consulting the District Forest Officer.

3. It is possible that ryots want to take up reserved forest because it is virgin soil: without any intention of bringing it under permanent cultivation and improving the land. If so, this method of cultivation must not be encouraged.

4. No new enclosures in reserves should be proposed in any case. Only lands which are on the outer edge of reserved forest and adjoining existing patta lands should be considered for disarforestation, with a view to assignment".

5. I have thus far received revised proposals or Collector's orders in 6 cases as detailed below:--

I. Minnium and Hoogiam. For reasons given in my Office-Note to the Collector No.806 Sub. of 1923, dated 5th August 1923 I could not recommend the disafforestation of as much as 1500 acres in the Minnium enclosure of Yedayarhally Reserved Forest. The Tahsildar and the Ranger, who, at the instance of the Revenue Division Officer made a joint inspection of the locality, found that 245 acres of assessed waste and 195 acres of poramboke lands were fit for cultivation. The Collector informed me on 11th December 1923 that the reference was pending with the Revenue Divisional Officer. I learn that this Officer has since sent in his report and am awaiting final orders of the Collector whose personal inspection in the matter is probably pending.

6 II. Huthur(Gundimalam). The Collector considered the request of the people of Gundimalam Enclosure of Huthur village to be reasonable and ordered me in his referenceNo.12/24-B-1, dated 8th August 1924 to submit a draft notification for disafforesting 100 acres of

of land round the present enclosure. The proposals submitted in my letter No.1064/24-A-2, dated 25th July 1925 for disafforesting 3 blocks of land measuring acres 102.67 were approved and the blocks have, in Notification number 349 dated 17th November 1925 published on page 2248 of Part I of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 24th November 1925, ceased to be Reserved Forest from 15th January 1926.

III. Hondrabalu. In my letter L.Dis.No.671/24-A-2, dated 24th September 1924, I informed the Revenue Divisional Officer that it would be injurious to disafforest the portion applied for by the ryots as it contains a rich growth of sandal trees which require rigid protection and I am not aware of any further proposals submitted by this officer to the Collector.

IV. Bylore. In my office-note C.No.1019/24-A-2, dated 24th November 1924, I reported to the Collector that the portion of the Doddasampagai Reserved Forest(called Kanmala Forest) could not with due regard to the interest of the sandalwood growth thereon, be disafforested and that even if we did not mind the sandalwood growth, the proposal could not benefit the poorer classes(Adidravidas and Sholagars) on whose behalf it was made, as the initial cost of clearing the jungle would entail considerable outlay which they could not arrora and for which they would eventually [illegible] to sell the lands to the more well to do Sivachars. I have not received the Collector's orders on the proposal. The Conservator inspected the area on the 10th August 1925.

V. Maduvahahally. The Conservator was not prepated to consider disafforestation unless land was urgently needed for cultivation(vide his order R.O.C.No.939/22-1, dated12th May 1922), have not received any further proposals from the Revenue Department.

VI. Bandally.
VII. Palayam.
VIII. Lokkanahally. (Andipalayam)
IX. Ramapuram.

The petitions from the ryots of these villages for disafforestation of land were rejected by the Revenue Divisional Officer in March 1923 apparently in pursuance of the policy laid down in Collector's Proceedings Ref.No.B-1-3669/22, dated 4th February 1923 and his letter 1428/24-B-1, dated 15th April 1924 in reply to Chief Conservator's Procgs. Mis. No.52 dated 19th February 1924.

The Collector's reply Ref.No.1428/24-B-1 dated 15th April 1924 to Chief Conservator's Proceedings Mis. No.52, dated 19th February 1924 deals also with the following villages:--

X. Modally. In his proceedings Ref.No.2354/B-1, dated 8th May 1924. the Collector consideredthat the request of the ~~Collector~~ ryots of Kongarhally village for ~~making~~ assignment of 150 acres in Guligy Reserved Forest was objectionable.

He was, however, in favour of granting them 230 acres in the Kannur Fuel Working Circle(Doddasampagai Reserved Forest) and called for a draft notification under Section 24 of the Forest Act for disafforesting the area. The proposals submitted in my letter Ref. No.672/24, dated 17th January 1925 for disafforesting 179 acres was however vetoed by the Chief Conservator in

29

14

in his letter Reference No.1518/25-1, dated 25th March 1925 to the Collector of Coimbatore. p 15 (I)

13 XI. Sularipalayam. (Pachadoddi Enclosure) in Hanur Reserved Forest.) The Collector(Mr. H. A. B. Vernon) was of opinion that if there was a real demand for fresh land, there would have been in the ordinary course -- applications for the grant of the present area(50 acres) of assessed waste on patta. He was not in favour as a general rule of ~~xxx~~ disafforestation when the amount of cultivable land already attached to a village had not been taken up. The Conservator has also expressed the same opinion in his Office-Note No.1447/22-2, dated 30th July 1922.

J. Sadasivam 14.3.26

To

The District Forest Officer,
Kollegal Division.

C.L.L.14-3-26.

Despatched 14.3.26

OFFICE OF THE CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS
Cur 290/26 C1
31 MAR 1926
FIFTH CIRCLE

L.Dis. 9145/26-B-1.

Forwarded.

2. Item Nos. I and IV are pending personal inspection which will be done as soon as circumstances permit.

Coimbatore Collector's Office,
Dated the 29th March 1926.

for Collector.

A.P.L/29-3-26.

To

The Chief Conservator of Forests, Madras.

30MAR 26

The ~~The~~ Conservator, V Circle, Coimbatore.

Roc 290-26 C1

Forwarded.
Orders regarding a portion of Bylore (item IV of the District Forest officer's report) were passed in your Proceedings No 320 mis. dated 11-12-1925 when 102.67 acres were disforested.

(6)

D'Abreu 15.4.26

Conservator of Forests V Circle.

19 APR 1926

15

Development Department.

L.C.Question No.2093 (starred)

Mr. C.V.Venkataramana Ayyangar.

Draft Answer.

will the Hon: the Home Member be pleased to state:-

(a) whether the Collector of Coimbatore and other officers have received several applications from the ryots in various parts of the Kollegal taluk that there are no sufficient lands for cultivation in that taluk and that specific portions of reserved forests may be granted to them for cultivation purposes; and

(b) whether the Revenue divisional officer has recommended the grant of some lands and if so what has become of those recommenations?

(a) and (b). Yes. Some of the areas have been disforested and proposals for the disforestation of some other areas are under consideration.

14/5/26.

15.5.26.

DESPATCHED
16 JUN 1926

16

1993

12-7-26.

Question No.2093 (Starred)

Mr.C.V.Venkataramana Ayyangar.

Will the Hon. the Home Member be pleased to state:-

(a) whether the Collector of Coimbatore and other officers have received several applications from the ryots in various parts of the Kollegal taluk that there are no sufficient lands for cultivation in that taluk and that specific portions of reserved forests may be granted to them for cultivation purposes; and

(b) whether the Revenue divisional officer has recommended the grant of some lands and if so what has become of those recommendations?

Development Department.

(a) and (b). Yes. Some of the areas have been disforested and proposals for the disforestation of some other areas are under consideration.

V.Pandrang Row
Secretary to Government.

Fort St.George,)
16th June 1926.)

To the Legislative Council office.

F o r w a r d e d.
(By order)

Rai Ramanatha Ayyar
16/6
Superintendent.

(The above answer has been approved by the Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur).

17

Applications for grant of reserve forests for cultivation in Kollegal taluk.

*1993 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Collector of Coimbatore and other officers have received several applications from the ryots in various parts of the Kollegal taluk that there are no sufficient lands for cultivation in that taluk and that specific portions of reserved forests may be granted to them for cultivation purposes; and

(*b*) whether the Revenue Divisional Officer has recommended the grant of some lands and if so, what has become of those recommendations?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Yes. Some of the areas have been disforested and proposals for the disforestation of some other areas are under consideration.

Law Dept. III-8—2,500—23-2-25

QUESTION.—No. 2093 for the meeting of the Legislative Council to be held ~~on the~~ during the ~~102~~ Session.

SUBMITTED that two copies of this Question may be forwarded to the Development Department.

D 595-1
22-2-26.

The Question has been admitted.

U.O. No. , *dated*

To

The Dev Department.

Dev: Dept

To Under Secy

Please see L.C. Question in the C/f. It is a starred question. There is no information in this office on the points raised in the Quest. The information may, it is submitted, be called for from the C.C. Draft Qn is submi

Ms.
23-2-26.
23.2.26

+ Lent for issue 24/2

Ms
23 2 26

To W.S.

Please see C.C's Ltr at P/8 & C/f. communicating the report of the S.D.O. Kollegal dismissing summarily full information. A draft answer is submitted.

Ms.
14/5/26

Ms.
12/5/26.
14.5.26

S.

Ms
15.5.26

C3 Ms.
15/5/26

Ci 15/5
N 15/5

MN
15/5/26

3

To A.S.

Please extract of Council Proceedings at page 17 c.f. The papers may now be ~~Lodged~~ ~~Lodged~~ Lodged

G.O. Mis. No X

Recorded

17-8-26.

17.8.26.

Lr No 1209 d 19/8/26

Recorded

18/8

L.C. Qr - Reserve forest - Applⁿ of Kandi in for cultivation

L-C-2m

Grant of reserved forest for cultivation in Kollegal Taluk.

Number checked & passed 19/8/26